

Application No. 10/751,411
Amendment dated August 3, 2007
Reply to Office Action of May 3, 2007

Docket No.: 0941-0893P

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are now present in this application.

Claims 1, 3, 6 and 8 have been amended. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The claims are objected to for a grammatical informality. Because this informality has been addressed by the foregoing amendments, it is requested that this objection now be reconsidered and withdrawn. These changes were not in response to a statutory requirement.

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Saga et al, US Patent 5,425,109. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Saga et al in view of Eller et al, US Patent 5,287,417. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 4, 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Saga et al in view of Gebhard et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In regard to claims 1 and 7, Saga et al does not teach or suggest what the examiner relies upon it as supposedly teaching. Saga et al fails to disclose, suggest, or teach, inter alia, the following feature recited by above claims of the present application:

“acquiring position information for two nodes of the image from user input”;
“determining to *generate a curve sketching a segment of an outline of the image between the two nodes according to the two nodes*”;
“acquiring position information of a new node on the image from additional user input”;
“determining to *generate another curve sketching another segment of the outline of the image between the new node and the node where the previous curve ends according to the new node and the node where the previous curve ends*”; and
“repeating the step of acquiring position information of nodes and curve generation accordingly until the outline of the image is completely sketched”.

Application No. 10/751,411
Amendment dated August 3, 2007
Reply to Office Action of May 3, 2007

Docket No.: 0941-0893P

In the Saga et al reference, a freehand curve drawing is first drawn on the display/input surface (lines 26-27 of col. 9), and the freehand curve drawing is then recognized to generate a curve recognition result (lines 40-54, col. 9). That is the final curve is generated according to the freehand curve drawing. In the application, however, the curve is generated according to **two nodes or a new node with an end node of previously generated curve**. No need of "curve" as input for the application. In other words, the Saga et al reference regards to recognition of curves, but the application regards to automatic generation of curves. The two applications are totally different.

Additionally, the partition point is used to partition the freehand curve drawing into segments. In the application, however, two nodes can be used to generate a curve, and a new node can be integrated with an end node of previously generated curve, and used to generate another curve. The use of the input node (partition point) of the application and the Saga et al reference is different.

Since Saga et al and Eller et al fail to teach the claimed features above of the invention, claims 1 and 6 should be patentable over the cited reference. Insofar as claims 2-5 directly or indirectly depend from claim 1, and claims 7-10 directly or indirectly depend from claim 6 are similarly believed to be patentable. The secondary reference to Gebhard et al. does not overcome the noted deficiencies of the Saga et al and Eller et al references.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, the pending application should be in condition for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No. 10/751,411
Amendment dated August 3, 2007
Reply to Office Action of May 3, 2007

Docket No.: 0941-0893P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 3, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant